

United States Patent and Trademark Office

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/827,064	(04/19/2004	Cyril Cabral, JR.	YOR919990509US3 (13171AB)		
23389	7590	03/29/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
		TURPHY & PR	DOTY, HEAT	DOTY, HEATHER ANNE		
400 GARDE SUITE 300	N CITY F	'LAZA		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
GARDEN CITY, NY 11530				2813		

DATE MAILED: 03/29/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	 	Annalis Aires No		n:
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	Office Astion Occurrence	10/827,064	CABRAL, ET AL.	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Heather A. Doty	2813	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence addres:	s
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.15 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period vere to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tiruly vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from 1, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this commun ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>17 Jac</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.		rits is
Dispositi	on of Claims			
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>24,25 and 28-33</u> is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) <u>32 and 33</u> is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>24,25 and 28-31</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.		
Applicati	on Papers			
9)□ ¹ 10)⊠ ¹	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on 19 April 2004 is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	☑ accepted or b)☐ objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.	
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureausee the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stag	je
2) Notice 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Di 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:)

Application/Control Number: 10/827,064

Art Unit: 2813

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Applicant's arguments regarding the rejection of claims 31 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. 112 are persuasive. The rejection is hereby withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 24, 25, and 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Legoues et al. (US 5,810,924), assigned to the same assignee as the instant application, in view Besser et al. (US 6,165,903) and Rosvold (U.S. 3,855,612).

Regarding claim 24, Legoues et al. discloses an electrical contact to a region of a silicon-containing substrate comprising, a substrate having an exposed region of a silicon-containing semiconductor material (paragraph bridging cols. 5-6); and a first layer of Ni silicide, wherein said substrate and said first layer are separated by a Si-Ge interlayer 12 (col. 6, lines 6-24; paragraph bridging cols.14-15).

Legoues et al. does not indicate that the nickel silicide is nickel monosilicide (NiSi) or that the nickel monosilicide comprises at least one of the claimed additives.

Besser et al. teaches that it is know in the art that NiSi, by contrast to the disilicides of Ti and Co (TiSi₂ and CoSi₂), is the low-resistivity phase of nickel silicide (col. 1, lines 22-30).

Page 3

Harvey III have been about the second of a site of the second of the sec

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to use nickel monosilicide as the nickel silicide in Legoues et al. because it is the low-resistivity phase of the nickel silicide, as taught to be well know in the art by Besser et al.

Rosvold teaches forming nickel silicide comprising platinum as an additive (52 in Fig. 6; column 5, lines 24-47) on a silicon substrate (column 3, lines 33-38), to form a contact with low resistance (column 7, lines 10-12) that operates very effectively with either gold or aluminum bonding systems (column 7, lines 46-48). Rosvold discloses that the Ni(Pt)Si ternary has a composition that is approximately 50% silicon, 45% nickel, and 5% platinum (column 5, lines 33-43), indicating that nickel monosilicide with small amounts of platinum additive is the silicide formed by Rosvold's process.

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Besser et al. and Legoues et al. with the teachings of Rosvold to add an additive such as platinum to nickel monosilicide to form an electrical contact. The motivation for doing so at the time of the invention would have been that such a silicide offers low contact resistance and operates effectively with either gold or aluminum bonding systems, as expressly taught by Rosvold.

Regarding claim 25, Legoues et al. discloses the electrical contact of claim 24 wherein said silicon-containing semiconductor material comprises, *inter alia*, single-crystal Si and SiGe (paragraph bridging cols. 5-6).

Regarding claims 28-30, Legoues et al. discloses a p-i-n diode 25, therefore the substrate necessarily includes a doped p+ and n+ regions. While the nomenclature "+"

is not used, the "+" is a relative term of degree and does not have patentable weight absent a specifically claimed amount.

Regarding claim 31, Legoues et al., Besser et al., and Rosvold together teach the electrical contact of claim 24 wherein one additive is Pt (see 35 USC 103(a) rejection of claim 24 above).

Claims 24, 25, and 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshimi et al. (US 5,698,869) in view of Besser et al. (U.S. 6,165,903) and Rosvold (U.S. 3,855,612).

Regarding claim 24, Yoshimi et al. discloses an electrical contact to a region of a silicon-containing substrate comprising, a substrate 201 having an exposed region of a silicon-containing semiconductor material (Fig. 14); and a first layer of Ni silicide 74, wherein said substrate and said first layer are separated by a Si-Ge interlayer 47 (Fig. 14, paragraph bridging cols. 19-20, col. 20, lines 50-60, and col. 21, lines 50-54).

Yoshimi et al. does not indicate that the nickel silicide is nickel monosilicide (NiSi) or that the nickel monosilicide comprises at least one of the claimed additives.

Besser et al. teaches that it is know in the art that NiSi, by contrast to the disilicides of Ti and Co (TiSi₂ and CoSi₂), is the low-resistivity phase of nickel silicide (col. 1, lines 22-30).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to use nickel monosilicide as the nickel silicide in Yoshimi et al. because it is the low-resistivity phase of the nickel silicide, as taught to be well know in the art by Besser et al.

Rosvold teaches forming nickel silicide comprising platinum as an additive (52 in Fig. 6; column 5, lines 24-47) on a silicon substrate (column 3, lines 33-38), to form a contact with low resistance (column 7, lines 10-12) that operates very effectively with either gold or aluminum bonding systems (column 7, lines 46-48). Rosvold discloses that the Ni(Pt)Si ternary has a composition that is approximately 50% silicon, 45% nickel, and 5% platinum (column 5, lines 33-43), indicating that nickel monosilicide with small amounts of platinum additive is the silicide formed by Rosvold's process.

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Besser et al. and Yoshimi et al. with the teachings of Rosvold to add an additive such as platinum to nickel monosilicide to form an electrical contact. The motivation for doing so at the time of the invention would have been that such a silicide offers low contact resistance and operates effectively with either gold or aluminum bonding systems, as expressly taught by Rosvold.

Regarding claim 25, Yoshimi et al. discloses the electrical contact of claim 24 wherein said silicon-containing semiconductor material comprises, *inter alia*, silicon-on-insulator (SOI) (col. 19, lines 50-54).

Regarding claims 28-30, Yoshimi et al. discloses the electrical contact of claim 24 wherein said substrate 201 is p-type doped (Fig. 14; col. 19, lines 50-54) and therefore includes p+ doped regions. The substrate also includes n+ regions 206 (Fig. 4A). While the nomenclature "p+" is not used, the "+" is a relative term of degree and does not have patentable weight absent a specifically claimed amount.

Regarding claim 31, Regarding claim 31, Yoshimi et al., Besser et al., and Rosvold together teach the electrical contact of claim 24 wherein one additive is Pt (see 35 USC 103(a) rejection of claim 24 above).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 1/17/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's primary argument is that Rosvold does not teach nickel monosilicide with a platinum additive, but the examiner disagrees. Rosvold teaches (column 5, lines 33-42) that an alloy of nickel and platinum (disclosed in column 4, lines 47-53 to have a nickel concentration as high as 90%) combines with approximately equal amounts of silicon so that the ternary compound has a composition that is approximately 50% silicon. Nickel monosilicide (NiSi), as opposed to nickel disilicide (NiSi₂), has a composition that is approximately 50% silicon and 50% silicon. NiSi₂ has twice the number of Si atoms as Ni atoms, so its overall composition is approximately two-thirds silicon and one-third nickel. Therefore, since Rosvold teaches a compound having 50% silicon, it is nickel monosilicide with a platinum additive.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 32 and 33 are allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Prior art does not teach or suggest, in combination with the other claimed limitations, Ni monosilicide comprising at least one additive from the list claimed in either claim 32 or 33.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Heather A. Doty, whose telephone number is 571-272-8429. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl Whitehead, Jr., can be reached at 571-272-1702. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2813

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

had

CARL WHITEHEAD, JR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINED
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800